

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Office Action mailed February 15, 2008, Applicants sincerely request reconsideration in view of the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1-8, 10, and 12-17 are currently pending in the application, and have also been rejected. Claims 1-3, 6, 10, 12-14, and 17 have been amended. Claims 5 and 8 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter is added.

Applicants also request acknowledgement the 30th Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement filed on February 20, 2008.

Interview Summary

A telephonic interview was held between the Examiner and the Applicants' attorney on May 5, 2008. The attorney explained the amendments. The Examiner stated that the objections and the 112 rejection appear to be addressed adequately and he will further review the amendments subject to additional search. The Examiner's accommodation is appreciated.

Specification

The specification has been amended to address the objections listed in the Office Action for the specification and the drawing. Amendments to the specification are listed beginning on page 2 of this response.

Claim Objections

Claims 6, 10, and 17 have been amended to correct the objected informalities. Amended claims are listed beginning on page 3 of this response.

Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1 and 12 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1,31, and 36 of U.S. Patent No. 7,281,245 (hereinafter '245) in view of US 6,687,485 (hereinafter "*Hopkins*") and US 5,987,480 (hereinafter "*Donohue*").

A Terminal Disclaimer under 37 C.F.R. 3.73(b) is being filed along with this response. Applicants respectfully submit that in view of the Terminal Disclaimer, the double patenting rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections—35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 12-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 12 and 17 have been amended as indicated above. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 12-17 comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, in light of the amendments, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections—35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-6, and 12-16

Claims 1-6 and 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,687,485 (hereinafter "*Hopkins*") in view of US 6,990,654 (hereinafter "*Carroll*") and US 5,987,480 (hereinafter "*Donohue*").

Applicants' amended claim 1 recites a method of downloading software components from a remote source to a software application for providing updates or additions to application or document functionality, where the method includes, *inter alia*, "structuring the document to associate the document with the schema by annotating particular portions of the document with elements of the schema", "associating a document solution with the document structure, wherein at least one solution is associated with each element of the schema annotating the particular portions of the document, and wherein the document solution includes at least one from a set of a plurality of information tips to assist a user of the document and a plurality of document actions", "in response to initiation of editing of a particular portion of the document annotated with a schema element, calling on the document solution associated with the schema element",

“if the document solution is not present in the local library of software components, assembling a plurality of software components comprising a plurality of document solutions at a location remote from the document”, and “if the document solution is present in the local library of software components, determining whether the document solution requires updating, and if the document solution requires updating, assembling the plurality of software components comprising the plurality of document solutions at the location remote from the document.” The amendments are supported by the specification (Specification: page 2, line 29 through page 3, line 10). Among other differences, *Donohue*, *Carroll*, and *Hopkins* do not teach, or suggest the features of amended claim 1.

Hopkins describes a system and method for supplying a user of a web-based application with relevant interactive help/training content that corresponds to an object or page of the web-based application that the user's cursor is pointing to (*Hopkins*: Abstract, col. 2, lines 7-12). According to *Hopkins*, the help/training content may include instructions, policies, procedures, tips and other information that may be dynamically updated and delivered to the user and may be displayed in a separate browser window where general information related to a page or pages as well as specific information related to a particular object may be provided.

While discussing providing a user context sensitive information and showing the appropriate information at the appropriate time, *Hopkins* fails to teach or suggest in response to initiation of editing of a particular portion of the document annotated with a schema element, calling on the document solution associated with the schema element. More importantly, *Hopkins* does not disclose if the document solution is not present in the local library of software components, assembling a plurality of software components comprising a plurality of document solutions at a location remote from the document or if the document solution is present in the local library of software components, determining whether the document solution requires updating, and if the document solution requires updating, assembling the plurality of software components comprising the plurality of document solutions at the location remote from the document.

Carroll describes a system and a method for creating user interfaces for software applications that allow a developer to segregate the development of the user interface from the development of the underlying application logic (*Carroll*: Abstract, col. 3, lines 49-51).

According to *Carroll*, an applications graphical user interface specified using an XML document as an application interface file is parsed at application compile time, and the specifications therein used to retrieve graphical screen components from an interface library to create the user interface. A grammar file can be used to further specify the parsing of the application interface file according to *Carroll*, and impose consistency upon the interface development process.

Carroll also fails to teach or suggest in response to initiation of editing of a particular portion of the document annotated with a schema element, calling on the document solution associated with the schema element and if the document solution is not present in the local library of software components, assembling a plurality of software components comprising a plurality of document solutions at a location remote from the document. Determining whether the document solution requires updating if the document solution is present in the local library of software components and if the document solution requires updating, assembling the plurality of software components comprising the plurality of document solutions at the location remote from the document is also not taught or suggested by *Carroll*.

Donohue describes a system and method for delivering documents having dynamic content embedded over the worldwide Internet or a local internet or intranet (*Donohue*: Abstract, col. 3, lines 49-51). According to *Donohue*, document templates are created by embedding dynamic tags and flow directives in markup language documents, the dynamic tags and flow directives containing one or more names of content stored in the data source. The document templates are stored on the server computer. The server computer can receive requests from client computers connected to the Internet, the requests identifying desired documents to be delivered. In response to such a request, the server computer selects one of the document templates corresponding to the desired document, populates the document template with content stored in the data source based on respective values of content corresponding to names in the dynamic tags and flow directives, and delivers the populated document to the client computer (*Donohue*: col. 3, line 51 - col. 4, line 4).

As discussed in the previous response, *Donohue* does not disclose or suggest, associating a document solution with the document structure, where the solutions are associated with each element of a schema annotating the particular portions of the document and the document solution includes information tips to assist a user of the document or document actions.

Donohue simply describes an HTML document template, and further fails to disclose in response to initiation of editing of a particular portion of the document annotated with a schema element, calling on the document solution associated with the schema element and if the document solution is not present in the local library of software components, assembling a plurality of software components comprising a plurality of document solutions at a location remote from the document. Indeed, *Donohue* discloses “if no file is found, the original URL is not changed” (*Donohue*: col. 14, lines 7-10). This is teaching against the recited elements of claim 1.

Thus, the three references, individually or in combination, fail to render amended claim 1 obvious, and claim 1 is allowable. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested. Claims 2-4 depend from amended independent claim 1 with additional features. Thus, dependent claims 2-4 are allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 1. Therefore, based on the foregoing, the rejection of claims 2-4 should also be withdrawn. Claim 5 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicants' amended claim 6 recites a method of downloading software components from a remote source to a software application for providing a desired solution to a computer-generated document, where the method includes similar features to the method of claim 1 with additional elements, such as “if the document solution is not present in the local library of software components, calling a manifest of document solutions for the document solution, wherein the manifest of document solutions includes another attached schema for associating the manifest of document solutions with a file, a document, and an application enabled to call the manifest of document solutions for downloading required components of the document solution”, “if the document solution is present in the local library of software components, determining whether the document solution requires an update, and if the document solution requires an update, calling the manifest of document solutions for the document solution”, and “at the manifest, calling a database of user information with the identification of the user for obtaining profile information for the user of the computer-generated document, the profile information including at least one from a set of: a job description, a location, and a security clearance.”

As discussed above, the cited references do not disclose or suggest several elements of claim 1 common with amended claim 6. In addition, the cited references, individually or in

combination, fail to teach or suggest additional elements of claim 6, such as calling a manifest of document solutions for the document solution, the manifest of document solutions including another attached schema for associating the manifest of document solutions with a file, a document, and an application enabled to call the manifest of document solutions for downloading required components of the document solution. Obtaining profile information for the user of the computer-generated document that includes a job description, a location, and/or a security clearance is also not disclosed by the references. Thus, the method recited in Applicants' amended claim 6 is also not rendered obvious by *Donohue, Carroll, and Hopkins*, and the claim is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Applicants' amended claim 12 recites a computer-readable medium with computer executable instructions stored thereon which when executed by a computer perform a method of downloading software components from a remote source to a software application for providing updates or additions to application or document functionality, where the method includes similar actions to the method of amended claim 1. Therefore, *Donohue, Carroll, and Hopkins* fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of amended claim 12, and the claim is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above in conjunction with claim 1. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Claims 13 - 16 depend from amended independent claim 12 with additional features. Thus, dependent claims 13 - 16 are allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 12. Therefore, based on the foregoing, the rejection of claims 13 - 16 should also be withdrawn.

Claims 7 and 8

Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hopkins* in view of *Carroll* and *Donohue* as applied to Claim 6 above, and further in view of US 6,381,742 (hereinafter "*Forbes*"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claim 7 depends from amended independent claim 6 with additional features. As discussed above, claim 6 is not taught or suggested by the combination of *Donohue* and *Carroll*. *Forbes* discloses a software package manager that uses a distribution unit containing components for a software package and a manifest file that describes the distribution unit to manage the

installation, execution, and uninstallation of software packages on a computer (*Forbes*: Abstract, col. 2, lines 36-52). According to *Forbes*, information in the manifest file pertaining to a software package is stored in a code store data structure upon installation of the package. The manifest file also contains information that permits the software package manager to resolve any software dependencies upon installation. The software package manager uses the code store data structure to locate the required components when the software is executed and to remove the components appropriately when the software is uninstalled (*Forbes*: Abstract, col. 2, lines 36-52).

Thus, *Forbes* also fails the discussed elements of independent claim 6, individually or in combination with the other two references. Therefore, dependent claim 7 is allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 6 and by virtue of its additional features. Based on the foregoing, the rejection of claim 7 should also be withdrawn. Claim 8 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 10 and 17

Claims 10 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hopkins* in view of *Carroll*, *Forbes*, and *Donohue*. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Applicants' amended claim 10 recites a method of downloading software components from a remote source to a software application for providing a desired solution to a computer-generated document, where the method includes similar features to amended claims 1 and 6 as discussed above with additional elements. As mentioned previously, the combination of *Hopkins*, *Carroll*, and *Donohue* fails to describe several features of these claims such as a schema attached to the computer-generated document defining permissible data content, data type and data structure for the computer-generated document, calling a manifest of document solutions for the document solution, the manifest of document solutions including another attached schema for associating the manifest of document solutions with a file, a document, and an application enabled to call the manifest of document solutions for downloading required components of the document solution, and obtaining profile information for the user of the computer-generated document that includes a job description, a location, and/or a security clearance. *Forbes* does not cure the deficiencies of the first three references as discussed above

in conjunction with claim 7 (and claim 6). Therefore, claim 10 is allowable for at least the same reasons, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Applicants' amended claim 17 recites a computer-readable medium with computer executable instructions stored thereon which when executed by a computer perform a method of downloading software components from a remote source to a software application for providing a desired solution to a computer-generated document, where the method includes similar features to amended claims 1 and 6 as discussed above with additional elements such as "if the location includes a local library of software components in addition to the remote source, determining whether the document solution in the local library of software components requires an update, and if the document solution requires an update, calling the remote source location of the document solution identified by the document solution identification", "passing an identification of a user of the computer-generated document to the manifest of document solutions identified by the document solution identification as the location of the document solution", and "at the manifest of document solutions, calling a database of user information with the identification of the user for obtaining profile information for the user of the computer-generated document, the profile information including at least one from a set of: a job description, a location, and a security clearance." As discussed above in more detail, the cited references fail to teach or suggest several elements of claim 17 similar to claims 1 and 6. The references also fail to teach any of the additional elements of claim 17. Therefore, claim 17 is also not rendered obvious by the cited references, individually or in combination, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all pending claims are believed to be allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the applicant at the telephone number provided below.

Please charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 16, 2008

By: /D. Kent Stier/
D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

Merchant & Gould
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-9946
Telephone: 404.954.5066



DKS:sm